

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Edwards for her analysis and detailed review of the Restriction Requirement and for thoughtful consideration of Applicant's Response to Restriction Requirement.

Claims 29-71, and 87-100 are presently pending in this application. Claims 1-28, and 72-86 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 87-100 are new. Claims 29, 30, 31, 34-40, 56, 59, 60, 62, 64, 65, 69, and 70 have been amended. Claims 29, 38, 39, 40, 56, 62, 65, 69, 87, 88, 91, 96, and 97 are independent claims. Claims 38, 39, and 65 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, and claims 40-51, 53-55, and 58 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph

Claims 30 and 40-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has corrected the claims in order to comply with the requirement.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant greatly acknowledges Examiner's indication that claims 38, 39, 40-51, 53-55, 58 and 65 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has rewritten claims

38, 39, 40 and 65 in independent form as suggested, and accordingly allowance of such claims and dependent claims is requested. Applicant has not rewritten claims 52, 53, 54, 55, or 58 in independent format, and submits that for the reasons set forth below, no such requirement is necessary.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b)

Claims 29-37, 52, 56, 57, 59-64, and 66-71 were rejected under U.S.C § 102 as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 4,953,734 to Stohr.

Claim 29 has been amended to more distinctly claim the invention and to overcome and patentably distinguish over the cited art. Independent claim 29 includes, among other features, a second lip extending from an outward end of a first lip, the second lip oriented at an acute angle with respect to the first lip. Stohr lacks features of a second lip extending from an outward end of a first lip and where the second lip is oriented at an acute angle with respect to the first lip. Accordingly, Stohr cannot anticipate the invention of claim 29, or claims depending therefrom. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Regarding claim 31, Stohr at least lacks a first lip extending generally perpendicular to a first side member of the at least first panel.

Regarding claim 34, Stohr at least lacks a first lip extending generally parallel to a side of the at least first panel.

Regarding claim 36, Stohr at least lacks a second end opposite the one of the ends, the first lip extending outward from the panel and away from the opposite end.

Regarding claim 37, Stohr at least lacks a first lip that is substantially flat.

Regarding independent claim 56, Stohr at least lacks a post securable to an adjacent panel, the post including a post wing having a post wing end, the post wing end abutting the second lip.

Regarding independent claim 62, Stohr at least lacks a first lip oriented substantially parallel to the at least one of the panels and a second lip oriented at an acute angle with respect to the first lip, the second lip extending toward the at least one of the panels.

Regarding independent claim 69, Stohr at least lacks a first lip extending generally perpendicular to a first side member of the one of the panels.

New Claims

New independent claims 87, 88, 91, 96, and 97 also are not anticipated by Stohr or the cited art.

Regarding independent claim 87, Stohr at least lacks a first lip oriented substantially parallel to the one of the panels.

Regarding independent claim 88, Stohr at least lacks a first lip extending from a first end in a first direction, and where a third lip is formed at a second end of the at least first panel, the third lip extending from the second end in the first direction.

Regarding independent claim 91, Stohr at least lacks a third lip formed at a second end of the first panel, the second panel having a second panel first lip and a second panel second lip, the third lip abutting the second panel second lip.

Regarding independent claim 96, Stohr at least lacks a channel positioned at an exterior side of the spray booth.

Regarding independent claim 97, Stohr at least lacks a first lip oriented substantially parallel to the first panel and extending from the first end in a first direction, and a third lip formed at a second end of the at least first panel, the third lip extending from the second end in the first direction.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all outstanding rejections or objections have been addressed and are now either overcome or moot. Applicant further submits that all claims pending in this application are patentable over the prior art made of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached by telephone at (715) 835-5232 or by facsimile at (715) 835-9890. All correspondence should be directed to the below listed address.

Respectfully Submitted,

/anthony j. bourget/

By: Anthony J. Bourget
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 36,753

AJB:naz
Enclosures

CC: Noel G. Smith